arXiv:1610.01939v1 [math-ph] 6 Oct 2016

MATHEMATICAL RESULTS ON MANY-BODY-LOCALIZATION IN THE DISORDERED XY SPIN CHAIN

HOUSSAM ABDUL-RAHMAN, BRUNO NACHTERGAELE, ROBERT SIMS, AND GÜNTER STOLZ

Abstract. We review several aspects of Many-Body Localization as manifested in disordered XY chains: localization properties of the energy eigenstates and thermal states, propagation bounds of Lieb-Robinson type, decay of correlation functions, absence of particle transport, bounds on the bipartite entanglement, and bounded entanglement growth under the dynamics. We also prove new results on the absence of energy transport and Fock space localization. All these properties are made accessible to mathematical analysis due to the exact mapping of the XY chain to a system of quasi-free fermions given by the Jordan-Wigner transformation. Motivated by these results we discuss conjectured properties of more general disordered quantum spin and other systems as possible directions for future mathematical research.

1. Introduction

Quantum spin systems provide a promising class of models in the quest for a better understanding of many-body localization (MBL). In particular, spins (as opposed to, say, electrons) are zero-dimensional and have essentially trivial one-body dynamics, so that studying systems of interacting spins allows to fully focus on many-body effects and thus provides a clear view on the various phenomena which are physically associated with MBL. While studying MBL in systems of interacting fermions remains a long-term goal, in the meantime quantum spin systems provide an ideal laboratory to help identifying the relevant effects characterizing MBL and how they manifest themselves.

The most recent decade has seen extensive research on MBL in the physics literature. A key insight at the beginning of much of this work was the understanding that MBL should be understood as localization in Fock space, which provides a means to describe that the eigenstates of an interacting many-body system in the MBL phase should arise as perturbations of the eigenstates of the corresponding non-interacting system. This point of view was stressed in [9] and [22], as well as earlier work in [5]. We will return to this below.

Some of the works which followed and laid further groundwork for describing the many-body localization transition are [40, 54, 41, 27, 51]. These and other works also shifted focus to using quantum spin systems as models for understanding MBL. We will point to additional physics references in more concrete contexts below, but do not attempt to provide a comprehensive list. Instead, we refer to the survey articles by Abanin and Papic as well as by Modugno, to be published in the same volume as this article, for a more complete discussion of the current state of knowledge on MBL in theoretical and experimental physics.

In this work our main goal is to describe a broad range of MBL properties of the disordered XY chain, where fully rigorous proofs can be given. This is due to the fact, going back to [33], that the XY chain, via the Jordan-Wigner transform, can be reduced to a free Fermion system. Thus the XY chain becomes exactly solvable in the translation invariant case. For variable coefficients, the case relevant to us here, the Jordan-Wigner transform reduces the

XY chain to the study of an effective one-particle Hamiltonian. Thus properties of the one-particle Hamiltonian translate to properties of the many-body spin system, where some attention has to be given to locality issues (as the Jordan-Wigner transform is non-local).

If, for example, a translation invariant XY chain is subjected to a random transversal magnetic field, then the effective Hamiltonian becomes the Anderson model. As a consequence, known localization properties of the Anderson model can be used to rigorously prove MBL properties of the XY chain in random field. Here we will discuss a broad range of results of this type. In particular, we will describe recent results on MBL in the disordered XY chain and closely related disordered free Fermion systems from [23, 47, 42, 2, 1]. In the last two subsections we will also include several previously unpublished results, where we will provide detailed proofs.

Sections 2 and 3 briefly recall the reduction of the XY chain, via the Jordan-Wigner transform, to a free Fermion system and discuss eigencorrelator localization for the associated effective Hamiltonian. Throughout our work we will use this well understood form of one-particle localization to derive MBL properties of the XY chain.

Among the MBL results covered is absence of many-body transport in the form of vanishing group velocity (i.e. a so-called zero-velocity Lieb-Robinson bound), see Section 4. Following earlier discussion in [14], this was rigorously shown in [23].

In Section 5 we present results of [47], showing that *all* eigenstates of the disordered XY chain, as well as thermal states at any inverse temperature, have exponentially decaying correlations. In this context we stress that, in order to be interpreted as an MBL property, it is important to be able to go beyond ground state correlations, as MBL should reflect the existence of a mobility gap without the need of a ground state gap.

In Section 6 we discuss area laws for the bipartite entanglement of eigenstates. The validity of such bounds at macroscopic energies (going beyond the gapped ground state phase where area laws were first identified in [25]) is considered another characteristic of MBL, see e.g. [10] and [11]. For the disordered XY chain a uniform area law for all eigenstates was shown in [2], see (28) in Section 6.

Similar methods can also be used to prove an area law for the dynamical entanglement, i.e. that the entanglement entropy of an initial product state stays uniformly bounded in time. Bounds on the dynamical entanglement in disordered spin chains were previously discussed in [8, 46, 52, 26]. A rigorous result for the XY chain, proven in [1], is presented as (29) in Section 6 below.

A related open problem is to better understand entanglement bounds for thermal states and, in particular, getting such bounds on efficient entanglement measures of thermal states such as the logarithmic negativity. However, an area law uniform in all eigenstates easily implies an area law for the entanglement of formation of thermal states, see (38).

Results on the absence of particle transport and energy transport are discussed in Section 7. Here we will focus mostly on the isotropic XY chain, which preserves the number of up-spins or 'particles' (in the interpretation as a free Fermion system), thus leading to stronger results. The results on energy transport, Theorems 7.1 and 7.2 have not been published before. Thus we state them more formally and include a detailed proof in Appendix A.

Finally, in Section 8, we return to the concept of Fock space localization. As discussed in several of the references given above, this concept is emerging as the central characteristic of MBL, leading to many of the manifestations noted above as secondary consequences. In this context, our main result for the disordered XY chain is part (a) of Theorem 8.1, which

shows that the eigenstates of the interacting spin chain are close, in suitable sense, to the eigenstates of the non-interacting system. As a distance measure we choose distance of Fock space configurations. Part (b) of Theorem 8.1 illustrates this, with a simpler proof, in terms of local spin occupation numbers. These are new results for which we provide proofs in Appendix B. We note that these proofs use the *eigensystem multiscale analysis* proposed recently in [18], which yields the strong form of uniform eigenvector localization stated in Section 8.

In the concluding summary section we mention some conjectures and possible directions for future mathematical research.

2. XY chain and effective Hamiltonian

A general XY spin chain in transversal field is described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j((1+\gamma_j)\sigma_j^X\sigma_{j+1}^X + (1-\gamma_j)\sigma_j^Y\sigma_{j+1}^Y) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j\sigma_j^Z, \tag{1}$$

where σ_j^X, σ_j^Y and σ_j^Z are the standard Pauli matrices acting on the j-th spin. The parameter sequences μ_j, γ_j and ν_j, describing the interactions strength, anisotropy and field strength, are viewed as random parameters reflecting the disorder in the system. We will generally assume that all three sequences are independent and identically distributed, with bounded distribution, although this could be weakened in several ways (as long as the required localization properties of the effective Hamiltonians, see below, can be shown).

We will state all results for the finite XY chain, i.e. restricted to the interval $\Lambda = [1, n]$, although with constants bounded uniformly in n. This allows to draw conclusions for the infinite chain, although we will not disucss this here.

The Jordan-Wigner transform $c_1 = a_1$, $c_j = \sigma_1^Z \dots \sigma_{j-1}^Z a_j$, $j = 2, \dots, n$, with the spin lowering operators $a_j = (\sigma_j^X - i\sigma_j^Y)/2$, satisfies the canonical anti-commutation relations (CAR) $\{c_j, c_k^*\} = \delta_{jk}$, $\{c_j, c_k\} = \{c_j^*, c_k^*\} = 0$, and maps the XY chain onto a system of quasi-free Fermions governed by

$$H = \sum_{j,k} \left(c_j^* A_{jk} c_k - c_j A_{jk} c_k^* + c_j^* B_{jk} c_k^* - c_j B_{jk} c_k\right) \tag{2}$$

Here A and B are the tridiagonal $n \times n$-matrices

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -\nu_1 & \mu_1 & & \\ \mu_1 & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \mu_{n-1} \\ & & \mu_{n-1} & -\nu_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mu_1\gamma_1 & & \\ -\mu_1\gamma_1 & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \mu_{n-1}\gamma_{n-1} \\ & & -\mu_{n-1}\gamma_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

If $\gamma_j = 0$, $j \in \Lambda$, i.e. for the isotropic XY chain, we have $B = 0$ and the matrix A has the role of an effective Hamiltonian. In the general anisotropic case the effective Hamiltonian is the $2n \times 2n$-matrix $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & -A \end{pmatrix}$. However, to correctly reflect locality properties, we re-index this matrix and write the spin Hamiltonian as the quadratic form

$$H = \mathcal{C}^* M \mathcal{C} \tag{4}$$

in terms of the column vector $\mathcal{C} = (c_1, c_1^*, \ldots, c_n, c_n^*)^t$ and effective Hamiltonian given as the 2×2-block Jacobi matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} -\nu_1 \sigma^Z & \mu_1 S(\gamma_1) & & \\ \mu_1 S(\gamma_1)^t & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \mu_{n-1} S(\gamma_{n-1}) \\ & & \mu_{n-1} S(\gamma_{n-1})^t & -\nu_n \sigma^z \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

Here $\sigma^Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ is the third Pauli matrix and $S(\gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \gamma \\ -\gamma & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.

We note that, instead of the fermionic modes c_j and c_j^*, commonly used are also the Majorana fermions $a_j^+ = c_j^* + c_j$, $a_j^- = i(c_j^* - c_j)$, which lead to a slightly different (but unitarily equivalent) form of the effective Hamiltonian.

The quadratic Hamiltonian (4) can be diagonalized via a Boguliubov transformation implemented by a $2n \times 2n$ Bogoliubov matrix W (meaning that W is orthogonal with $WJW^t = J$ for $J = (\sigma^X)^{\oplus n}$). W diagonalizes M as

$$WMW^t = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_j & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_j \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}$$

with $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n$ (which can be identified as the singular values of $A + B$, e.g.[23]). This gives a new set of fermionic modes b_j, b_j^*, represented in vector form as $\mathcal{B} = W\mathcal{C}$, which expresses H as a free fermion system,

$$H = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j b_j^* b_j - E_0 \mathbb{1}, \tag{7}$$

with $E_0 = \sum_j \lambda_j$. The Fock basis

$$\psi_\alpha = \prod_{j=1}^{n} (b_j^*)^{\alpha_j} \psi_0, \quad \alpha \in \{0,1\}^n, \tag{8}$$

with respect to the vacuum vector ψ_0 of this system gives a full set of eigenvectors of H with corresponding eigenvalues $\sum_{j:\alpha_j=1} \lambda_j - E_0$.

3. One-Particle Localization

The phenomena of single-particle localization and many-body localization should be clearly distinguished. The latter describes properties of group waves as opposed to waves associated with individual particles in a many-body system. For the XY chain, however, MBL properties of H are consequences of single-particle localization properties of the effective Hamiltonian M (but note that M does not act on a spin, but on a particle with an infinite degree of freedom as $n \to \infty$, e.g. a one-dimensional 'electron').

While this is the main mechanism behind the results presented here, we stress that it makes the XY chain a rather unrealistic example of a many-body quantum system. One other example which shares the property of being fully reducible to an effective one-particle Hamiltonian are interacting harmonic quantum oscillators, see [38, 39]. For other classes of disordered quantum many-body systems the relation between one-particle and many-body

localization, and the variety of possible MBL regimes and phenomena, will likely be much more involved.

We will state results under the assumption of exponential *eigencorrelator localization* for M, i.e. the existence of a finite constant C and a positive constant η, not depending on n, such that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sup_{|g|\leq 1} \|g(M)_{jk}\| \Big) \leq Ce^{-\eta|j-k|} \tag{9}$$

for all $1 \leq j,k \leq n$. Here $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ denotes disorder averaging and $g(M)$ is defined via the spectral theorem for symmetric matrices, i.e. $g(M) = \sum_j g(\lambda_j)|\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|$, where ϕ_j and λ_j are a full system of eigenvectors and corresponding eigenvalues for M. For later convenience, we think of the $2n \times 2n$-matrix $g(M)$ and an $n \times n$-matrix with 2×2-matrix-valued entries $g(M)_{jk}$ and of $\|\cdot\|$ as a 2×2-matrix norm.

In the $n \to \infty$ limit, eigencorrelator localization (9) implies that M has pure point spectrum with exponentially decaying eigenfunctions (with η giving the inverse localization length), but is a mathematically stronger property. In particular, with the choice $g(M) = e^{-itM}$, it includes uniform exponential decay of time evolution amplitudes

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|(e^{-itM})_{jk}\| \Big) \leq Ce^{-\eta|j-k|}. \tag{10}$$

Also covered by (9) are the Fermi projectors $\chi_{(-\infty,E]}(M)$, i.e. eigenprojectors onto energies below E. Eigencorrelator localization in the above strong form allows to derive all the MBL properties to be discussed below.

For the isotropic case, M can be replaced by A in (9) and is known to hold for large classes of random parameters ν_j and μ_j. In particular, if $\mu_j = 1$ and the ν_j are i.i.d. with sufficiently smooth distribution (for example if they have bounded compactly supported density), then A is the one-dimensional Anderson model and (9) is known since the work of Kunz and Souillard [31] and, for larger classes and under weaker assumptions, can also be proven using the fractional moments method of Aizenman and Molchanov [3]. See [48, 4] for general introductions to the mathematical theory of Anderson localization.

Proving (9) in the anisotropic case is mathematically more challenging due to the lack of monotonicity of (5) in the random parameters. A general result of [20] covers the case of a magnetic field at large disorder, i.e. ν_j is multiplied with a sufficiently parameter λ. For additional results see [15].

For this work we use the assumption of *exponential* decay of eigencorrelators mostly for ease of presentation and for its physical relevance. Many of the results discussed below, in suitably modified form, also hold under weaker assumptions on eigencorrelator decay, such as sufficiently fast power law decay.

Another assumption needed for some of the results below is that

(11) all eigenvalues of H_n are non-degenerate for almost every realization of the disorder.

This is true, for example, if the random variables ν_j have continuous distribution, see Appendix A in [2].

4. Zero-velocity Lieb-Robinson bounds

A local observable acting on the j-th spin via the 2×2-matrix A will be denoted by A_j. For $j \neq k$ local observables commute: $[A_j, B_k] = 0$. Lieb-Robinson bounds, initially

introduced in [32], provide upper bounds on the propagation speed of group waves through the spin system by bounding the norm of the commutators under the time-evolution $\tau_t(A_j) = e^{itH} A_j e^{-itH}$ of one of the observables. In general, a Lieb-Robinson bound of the form

$$\|[\tau_t(A_j), B_k]\| \leq C\|A\|\|B\| e^{-\eta(|j-k|-vt)}, \tag{12}$$

with constants C and $\eta > 0$ which do not depend on n, j, k and t and hold for all local observables A and B, show that v is an upper bound on the group velocity in the system, see [37] for a survey of recent results and applications.

It was shown in [23] that the introduction of disorder into the XY-chain leads to Lieb-Robinson velocity zero in the disorder average: Under the one-particle localization condition (9) (in fact (10) suffices here) it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|[\tau_t(A_j), B_k]\|\right) \leq C'\|A\|\|B\| e^{-\eta|j-k|}, \tag{13}$$

uniformly in n and $1 \leq j, k \leq n$.

For the case of the isotropic XY-chain in random transversal field a slightly weaker form of this bound, with right hand side growing linearly in t and quadratically in n, was discussed earlier in [14]. The key fact behind the proof of (13) is the relation

$$\tau_t(\mathcal{C}) = e^{-2itM}\mathcal{C}, \tag{14}$$

where the time evolution of the vector $\mathcal{C}$ is understood componentwise. This relates the one-particle dynamics of M, given by the $2n \times 2n$-matrix e^{-2itM}, to the many body dynamics of $\mathcal{C}$ and thus, through Jordan-Wigner, of local observables in the spin chain. Here some care is needed to account for the non-locality of the Jordan-Wigner transform: Assume $k \geq j$, then (10), (14) and a geometric summation give

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t} \|[\tau_t(c_j), B_k]\|\right) \leq \frac{4C\|B\|}{1-e^{-\eta}} e^{-\eta(k-j)}. \tag{15}$$

Writing the local spin lowering operators as $a_j = \sigma_1^Z \dots \sigma_{j-1}^Z c_j$, an iterative argument based on the Leibnitz rule followed by another geometric sum gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t} \|[\tau_t(a_j), B_k]\|\right) \leq \frac{16C\|B\|}{(1-e^{-\eta})^2} e^{-\eta(k-j)}. \tag{16}$$

Using that a_j, a_j^*, $a_j^* a_j$ and $a_j a_j^*$ generate the local operators at site j, this leads to the claim (13) with $C' = 96C/(1-e^{-\eta})^2$. For more details see [23].

5. Rapid decay of correlations

One of the benefits of Lieb-Robinson bounds (with finite velocity v) is that they can be used to prove exponential clustering of the ground state for *gapped* spin systems, i.e. exponential decay of the ground state correlations

$$|\langle\psi_0, A_j B_k \psi_0\rangle - \langle\psi_0, A_j\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0, B_k\psi_0\rangle| \tag{17}$$

in $|j-k|$ for local observables A_j and B_k, see [24, 36].

In [23] it was shown that in the presence of a zero-velocity Lieb-Robinson bound the assumption of a uniform ground state gap can be relaxed, leading to a correction of the exponential clustering bound which is logarithmic in the inverse gap size. For the case of the isotropic XY-chain in random transverse field this leads to a bound of the form $C\|A\|\|B\| n e^{-\eta|j-k|}$ for the disorder average of ground state correlations (Theorem 4.2 in

[23]). The dependence on the length n of the chain is due to the use of a Wegner estimate for the Anderson model, giving a volume dependent ground state gap. For earlier work on this question, employing bounds on the Anderson model found by multiscale analysis, see [29].

We stress that rapid decay of ground state correlations, by itself, is not sufficient to indicate MBL, as it holds for many translation invariant systems, even without requiring a spectral gap [35, 21]. Rather, MBL should reflect a *mobility gap*, i.e. a range of energies near the bottom of the spectrum which is entirely many-body localized. For correlations in the disordered XY chain this was recently settled in full generality by Sims and Warzel [47]. They consider time dependent correlations

$$\langle \tau_t(A_j) B_k \rangle - \langle A_j \rangle \langle B_k \rangle \tag{18}$$

for the anisotropic disordered XY-chain (1), where $\langle \cdot \rangle = \mathrm{tr}(\rho\, \cdot)$ and $\rho = |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|$ for an arbitrary eigenstate ψ_α of H or a thermal state $\rho = e^{-\beta H} / \mathrm{tr}\, e^{-\beta H}$. Assuming eigencorrelator localization (9) it is shown that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\langle \tau_t(A_j) B_k \rangle - \langle A_j \rangle \langle B_k \rangle| \right) \leq C e^{-\eta |j-k|}, \tag{19}$$

where the constants $C < \infty$ and $\eta > 0$ can be chosen uniformly in the eigenstate label α and the inverse temperature $\beta > 0$, respectively. In fact, having exponential clustering for all eigenstates means that the disordered XY chain in fully many-body localized at all energies, i.e. in the infinite temperature limit.

Let us now discuss a few of the central ideas that are used in proving (19). In order to do so, we first review some basics about quasi-free states on the CAR algebra and refer the interested reader to e.g. [13] for more details. Recall that for any Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, one can associate to each $f \in \mathcal{H}$ annihilation and creation operators, which we label by $c(f)$ and $c^*(f)$ respectively. These operators act on the fermionic (i.e. anti-symmetric) Fock space $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ corresponding to $\mathcal{H}$ and satisfy canonical anti-commutation relations (CAR), i.e.

$$\{c(f), c(g)\} = \{c^*(f), c^*(g)\} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \{c(f), c^*(g)\} = \langle f, g \rangle \mathbb{1} \quad \text{for all } f, g \in \mathcal{H} \tag{20}$$

with $\{A, B\} = AB + BA$. The C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{H})$ generated by the identity $\mathbb{1}$ and the operators $c(f)$ and $c^*(g)$ for all $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$ is called the CAR algebra associated to $\mathcal{H}$.

A state ω on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be quasi-free if all its correlation functions can be computed using Wick's rule. An important sub-class of quasi-free states ω_ϱ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{H})$ are uniquely determined by a one-particle density operator $0 \leq \varrho \leq \mathbb{1}$ acting on $\mathcal{H}$. In this case, multipoint correlation functions corresponding to these states have a determinantal structure, e.g.

$$\omega_\varrho \left(c^*(g_m) \cdots c^*(g_1) c(f_1) \cdots c(f_m) \right) = \det \left(\langle f_j, \varrho g_k \rangle \right)_{1 \leq j,k \leq m} \tag{21}$$

for any $m \geq 1$ and $f_1, \cdots, f_m, g_1, \cdots, g_m \in \mathcal{H}$. Both classes of states considered in (19), i.e. eigenstates and thermal states of the XY-model, are quasi-free states on $\mathcal{A}(\ell^2([1,n]))$ with this particular form. We remark that a full characterization of quasi-free states on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{H})$ can be found in [6], but this goes beyond the scope of our applications.

A key result in [47] estimates structured determinants; in particular, the result applies to multi-point correlation functions associated to these quasi-free states, see (21), in the case that $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. (The result also applies in the case of $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2([1,n])$ for any $n \geq 1$.) To state a version of this result, first introduce for $m \geq 1$, an ordered configuration as

$\mathrm{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ with $x_1 < \cdots < x_m$. For any two such configurations x and y, denote a configuration distance by

$$D(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |x_j - y_j|. \tag{22}$$

The following is proven in [47].

Theorem 5.1. *Let $K : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ be monotone increasing and suppose there is some $\mu_0 \in (0, \infty)$ for which*

$$I(\mu_0) := \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (1 + \ell) e^{-\mu_0 K(\ell)} < \infty \tag{23}$$

For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\rho(t)$ be an operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ with $\|\rho(t)\| \leq 1$. If there is some $C < \infty$ and $\mu > \mu_0$ for which given any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, one has the estimate

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\langle \delta_x, \rho(t) \delta_y \rangle| \leq C e^{-\mu K(|x-y|)}, \tag{24}$$

then for any $m \geq 1$ and any pair of ordered configurations x *and* y*, one has that*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \det(\langle \delta_{x_j}, \rho(t) \delta_{y_k} \rangle)_{1 \leq j,k \leq m} \right| \leq C' \exp\left(-\frac{\mu - \mu_0}{2} K\left(\frac{D(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})}{2} \right) \right) \tag{25}$$

Here one may take $C' = 8 \max\{CI(\mu_0), \sqrt{CI(\mu_0)}\}$.

In words, this result shows that decay in the entries of a matrix, i.e. (24), does lead to a form of decay in the corresponding matrix determinant, see (25). The decay in the determinant is expressed in terms of the configuration distance $D(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$, see (22).

With these preliminaries, we can now give some rough ideas for how (19) is proven. Consider a quasi-free state ω_ϱ on $\mathcal{A}(\ell^2([1, n]))$ of the form described in (21) above and let τ_t denote the dynamics corresponding to the isotropic XY-model. For any pair of ordered configurations $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_m)$ and $\mathrm{y} = (y_1, \cdots, y_m)$, with components in $[1, n]$, one has

$$\omega_\varrho \left(\tau_t(c^*(\delta_{y_m})) \cdots \tau_t(c^*(\delta_{y_1})) c(\delta_{x_1}) \cdots c(\delta_{x_m}) \right) = \det\left(\langle \delta_{x_j}, \varrho e^{-2itA} \delta_{y_k} \rangle \right)_{1 \leq j,k \leq m} \tag{26}$$

where A is the effective one-particle Hamiltonian and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is arbitrary. Given the assumptions of exponential eigencorrelator localization and non-degeneracy, i.e. (9) and (11), one concludes that the matrix entries on the right-hand side of (26) decay and as a result, these multi-point correlations decay as well, by an application of Theorem 5.1. A technical point here is that the assumption of exponential eigencorrelator localization only guarantees that the disorder-averaged matrix entries, found on the right-hand side of (26), decay. However, a further result in [47], see Theorem 1.2 therein, proves a generalization of Theorem 5.1 which covers this random situation. In words, the proof shows that if the averaged matrix entries decay similarly to (24), then the averaged determinant decays similarly to (25) In particular, both results obtain estimates which are uniform in m, n, and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now, using the Jordan-Wigner transform, the dynamic correlations considered in (18) can be re-written in terms of time-dependent multi-point correlations, similar to those on the left-hand-side of (26), in specific quasi-free states with the form discussed above. In full generality, the evaluation of these multi-point correlations, i.e. the application of Wick's rule, results in a pfaffian; not a determinant. Since pfaffians and determinants share similar mathematical properties, it is not surprising that analogs of the theorems mentioned above

hold in this case as well. Such technical matters are discussed in detail and proven in [47]. It is with these ideas that (19) is proven.

6. Area laws for the bipartite entanglement

Another property which reflects many-body localization are area laws for the bipartite entanglement of eigenstates and for the time evolution of initially unentangled states, e.g. [8, 10, 11, 12, 26, 46]. In fact, such bounds are closely related to the rapid decay of correlations discussed in the previous section. Hastings showed in his seminal work [25] that the ground state of a uniformly gapped one-dimensional spin system satisfies an area law, i.e. its bipartite entanglement with respect to a subchain is uniformly bounded, independent of the length of the chain and the subchain. As mentioned above such systems also satisfy exponential clustering of the ground state. In fact, Brandao and Horodecki [11, 12] proved a general result saying that exponential decay of correlations of one-dimensional quantum states implies an area law. This does not only provide a new proof of Hastings' result, but also applies in cases where exponential decay of correlations is known for excited states, without knowledge on spectral gaps, and thus is applicable to the situation one wants to see in MBL. In particular, it is likely that the results of [23] and [47] on correlation decay in the disordered XY chain combine with the result of [12] to provide area laws for this example (with one obstacle arising from the fact that the correlation bounds required in [12] are stronger than those provided in [47]).

This is one of the reasons why it is desirable to have a more direct argument for an area law of the eigenstate entanglement in the example of the disordered XY chain. Towards this, decompose the chain Λ into left and right ends $A = [1, \ell]$ and $B = [\ell+1, n]$. For a pure state $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, let ρ_A and ρ_B be the corresponding reduced states. The bipartite entanglement of ρ with respect to this decomposition is the von Neumann entropy of the reduced state,

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \mathcal{S}(\rho_A) = -\operatorname{tr} \rho_A \log \rho_A. \tag{27}$$

Generic states will satisfy the volume law $\mathcal{E}(\rho) \sim \min\{\ell, n-\ell\}$ (using $\mathcal{S}(\rho_A) = \mathcal{S}(\rho_B)$). However, under the assumptions of one-particle localization (9) and non-degeneracy (11) on the XY chain, we have the uniform area law

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{\rho} \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right) \leq C < \infty, \tag{28}$$

where the supremum is taken over $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ for all normalized eigenstates ψ of H and the constant C can be chosen uniformly in n and ℓ. As before, this includes the disorder average $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$.

We may also consider the dynamical growth of entanglement under a quantum quench. For this, let ϕ_A and ϕ_B be eigenstates of H_A and H_B, the restrictions of the XY Hamiltonian to the left and right end chains, respectively. Starting with the product state $\rho = |\varphi_A \otimes \varphi_B\rangle\langle\varphi_A \otimes \varphi_B|$, we consider the time evolution $\tau_t(\rho) = e^{itH}\rho e^{-itH}$ under the full XY chain Hamiltonian. Under assumptions as above, the dynamical entanglement remains bounded,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t,\varphi_A,\varphi_B} \mathcal{E}(\tau_t(\rho))\right) \leq C < \infty, \tag{29}$$

uniform in n and ℓ, with supremum taken over all times $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as well as all eigenstates of H_A and H_B. In fact, this result extends to any finite number of quenches in the initial state, with bounds not depending on the number of quenches.

The proofs of (28) and (29) in [2] and [1] rely heavily on the fact that the eigenstates ρ of H are quasi-free, as already used in the previous section, so that they are entirely determined by their two-point function with respect to the fermionic modes c_j, c_j^*, summarized in the correlation matrix

$$\Gamma_\rho = \rho(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}^*), \tag{30}$$

which we use as vector notation for the $2n \times 2n$-matrix with 2×2-matrix-valued entries

$$\Gamma_\rho(j,k) = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{tr} c_j c_k^* \rho & \operatorname{tr} c_j c_k \rho \\ \operatorname{tr} c_j^* c_k^* \rho & \operatorname{tr} c_j^* c_k \rho \end{pmatrix}, \quad 1 \le j,k \le n. \tag{31}$$

As observed in [49], the entropy of quasi-free states can be calculated via the trace identity $\operatorname{Tr} \rho \log \rho = \operatorname{tr} \Gamma_\rho \log \Gamma_\rho$. Here we distinguish the traces tr and Tr in the one-particle space and many-particle space, respectively. Most importantly, the reduction ρ_A of ρ to the left end $[1,\ell]$ of the chain is again quasi-free, so that

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = -\operatorname{Tr} \rho_A \log \rho_A = -\operatorname{tr} \Gamma_\rho^A \log \Gamma_\rho^A. \tag{32}$$

Here the correlation matrix Γ_ρ^A of the reduced state is simply the upper left $2\ell \times 2\ell$-block of Γ_ρ (by the 'left locality' of the operators c_j and c_j^*).

By a calculation due to [42] this leads to the bound

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) \le 2 \ln 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{n} \|\Gamma_\rho(j,k)\|. \tag{33}$$

The eigenstates of H are given by the fermionic basis vectors ψ_α in (8). This allows to calculate the correlation matrices of $\rho = \rho_\alpha = |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|$ via the Bogoliubov transform $\mathcal{B} = W\mathcal{C}$ and (6) as

$$\Gamma_{\rho_\alpha} = \chi_{\Delta_\alpha}(M). \tag{34}$$

Here the right hand side is a spectral projection for the effective Hamiltonian M onto $\Delta_\alpha := \{\lambda_j : \alpha_j = 0\} \cup \{-\lambda_j : \alpha_j = 1\}$. Thus (32) and exponential eigencorrelator localization (9) lead to

$$\mathbb{E}(\sup_\alpha \mathcal{E}(\rho_\alpha)) \le 2 \ln 2\, C \sum_{j=-\infty}^{0} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-\eta|j-k|} = \frac{2 \ln 2\, C e^{-\eta}}{(1-e^{-\eta})^2}, \tag{35}$$

proving (28).

Similar arguments lead to the bound (29) on dynamical entanglement in [1]. In particular, this uses that the product states $\rho = |\varphi_A \otimes \varphi_B\rangle\langle\varphi_A \otimes \varphi_B|$ as well as their time evolution $\tau_t(\rho)$ under H are still quasi-free, so that $\mathcal{E}(\tau_t(\rho))$ can be calculated using (32). In this case the correlation matrix is given by

$$\Gamma_{\tau_t(\rho)} = e^{-2itM} \left(\chi_{\Delta_A}(M_A) \oplus \chi_{\Delta_B}(M_B)\right) e^{2itM}, \tag{36}$$

where M_A and M_B are restrictions of the effective Hamiltonian to A and B, respectively, and spectral projections analogous to (34) appear. Similar to above, now using eigencorrelator localization for M, M_A and M_B, this leads to (29).

Several remarks are in order here:

(i) The bound (35) on the entanglement grows as $O(\xi^2)$ as the one-particle localization length $\xi = 1/\eta$ diverges. This is substantially stronger than what one gets by combining

the general result of [12] with the bound on correlation decay from [47], giving the bound $O(e^{c\xi \log \xi})$ on the entanglement.

(ii) The argument leading to (33) was previously used in [42] to bound the entanglement in disordered d-dimensional free Fermion systems, where the general area law $O(\ell^{d-1})$ is found, both as upper and lower bound. Moreover, it was shown in [19] that the fermionic entanglement is self-averaging for $d > 1$ but not for $d = 1$. Note, however, that the fermionic entanglement has to be interpreted differently from entanglement in spin systems due to the non-locality of the fermionic modes, e.g. [7, 43], and that the connection to the XY chain via Jordan-Wigner only holds for $d = 1$.

(iii) In principle, the above result also applies to thermal states $\rho_\beta = e^{-\beta H}/\operatorname{tr} e^{-\beta H}$. In this case, instead of (34) the correlation matrix is $\Gamma_{\rho_\beta} = (\mathbb{1}+e^{-2\beta M})^{-1}$, so that the eigencorrelator bound (9) still applies and gives exponential decay of matrix elements and an area law for the bipartite entanglement $\mathcal{S}(\rho_\beta)$. However, for the mixed state ρ_β this is generally not considered a good entanglement measure (in particular, vanishing of $\mathcal{S}(\rho_\beta)$ does not mean that ρ_β is a product state). A better quantity to consider is the logarithmic negativity of ρ_β, e.g. [50, 44], but it remains an open problem if the logarithmic negativity of mixed states of the disordered XY chain satisfies an area law.

On the other hand, it follows easily from (28) that the *entanglement of formation* of thermal states satisfies an area law. The latter is the convex roof extension of the entanglement entropy [53], defined for a general mixed state ρ as

$$E_f(\rho) = \min_{p_k,\phi_k} \sum_k p_k \mathcal{E}(|\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|), \tag{37}$$

with arbitrary p_k and unit vectors ϕ_k such that $\rho = \sum_k p_k |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|$.

The thermal states are given by $\rho_\beta = Z_\beta^{-1} \sum_\alpha e^{-\beta q_\alpha} |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|$, where ψ_α and q_α are the eigenstates and eigenvalues of H and $Z_\beta = \sum_\alpha e^{-\beta q_\alpha}$. Using the uniform area law (28) for the eigenstates ψ_α this immediately leads to

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_\beta E_f(\rho_\beta)\right) \leq C < \infty, \tag{38}$$

an area law for the averaged entanglement of formation of the thermal states ρ_β, uniform in the inverse temperature β.

One also gets a similar extension of (29) to the case where $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ and ρ_A and ρ_B are thermal states of the subsystems.

7. Absence of particle and energy transport

Here we consider the isotropic XY chain, i.e. we set $\gamma_j = 0$ for all j in (1). Thus the matrix B in (3) vansihes and, using the CAR in (2), the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H_{iso} = -\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j (\sigma_j^X \sigma_{j+1}^X + \sigma_j^Y \sigma_{j+1}^Y) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j \sigma_j^Z = 2 \sum_{j,k} c_j^* A_{jk} c_k + \tilde{E}_0 \mathbb{1}, \tag{39}$$

where $\tilde{E}_0 = \sum_j \nu_j$. This simpler form of the quadratic Fermionic Hamiltonian (as compared to (2)) allows diagonalization via $(\tilde{b}_1, \ldots, \tilde{b}_n)^t := U(c_1, \ldots, c_n)^t$, i.e. a Bogoliubov transformation which does not mix creation and annihilation modes. Here U is the orthogonal matrix

which diagonalizes A:

$$UAU^t = \mathrm{diag}(\tilde{\lambda}_j), \tag{40}$$

with $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ the eigenvalues of A. One gets the free Fermion system

$$H_{iso} = 2\sum_j \tilde{\lambda}_j \tilde{b}_j^* \tilde{b}_j + \tilde{E}_0 \mathbb{1}. \tag{41}$$

Let ψ_0 be the vacuum vector associated with this free Fermion system and

$$\psi_\beta = \prod_{j=1}^n (\tilde{b}_j^*)^{\beta_j} \psi_0, \quad \beta \in \{0,1\}^n, \tag{42}$$

the corresponding Fermionic basis of eigenvectors of H_{iso}. Due to the non-mixing of modes, ψ_0 coincides with the all spins down vector e_0 and, for each $0 \leq k \leq n$, the k-particle space $\mathrm{span}\{\psi_\beta : \#\{j : \beta_j = 1\} = k\}$ coincides with the space spanned by the spin basis vectors e_α with k up-spins. Thus the number of up-spins is interpreted as the number of particles and $\mathcal{N} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^* a_j = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j^* c_j$ as the total particle number operator. Preservation of the particle number if reflected in the fact that H_{iso} commutes with $\mathcal{N}$.

For subsets $S \subset [1,n]$ the local particle number operators are $\mathcal{N}_S = \sum_{j\in S} a_j^* a_j$. For any state ρ the expected number of particles (up-spins) in S is given by $\langle \mathcal{N} \rangle_\rho = \mathrm{Tr}\, \rho \mathcal{N}_S$.

In the many-body localized phase one expects absence of particle transport. In fact, let S_1 and S_2 be two disjoint subsets of Λ such that $S_2 \subset \Lambda \setminus [\min S_1, \max S_1]$, i.e., S_1 is entirely surrounded by S_2. As initial state consider a particle profile

$$\rho = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \rho_j, \quad \rho_j = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_j & 0 \\ 0 & 1-\eta_j \end{pmatrix}, \tag{43}$$

and assume $\eta_j = 0$ for all $j \in \Lambda \setminus S_2$, meaning only down-spins outside S_2. Let $\rho_t = e^{-iHt} \rho e^{iHt}$ be the Schrödinger evolution. If exponential eigencorrelator localization (9) is assumed, then it can be shown that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_t \langle \mathcal{N}_{S_1} \rangle_{\rho_t} \right) \leq \frac{2C}{(1-e^{-\eta})^2} e^{-\eta d(S_1,S_2)}. \tag{44}$$

Here $d(S_1,S_2) = \min\{|x-y| : x \in S_1, y \in S_2\}$ is the distance of S_1 and S_2. This bound follows as a special case of Theorem 1.1 in [1]. The argument is similar to the proof of Theorem 7.1 below, provided in Appendix A.

Thus, if at time $t = 0$ all particles are concentrated in S_2 (corresponding to $\eta_j = 1$ for $j \in S_2$), then the number of particles at distance more than d from S_2 remains exponentially small in d, uniformly for all times t. As in the previous section, the bound diverges as $O(\xi^2)$ in the one-particle localization length $\xi = 1/\eta$. The proof of (44) can be seen from the proofs of Theorems 7.1 and 7.2 below.

Additional results of this type, establishing the absence of particle transport in the disordered isotropic XY chain, can be found in [1]. Similar results for the disordered Tonks-Girardeau gas, which can be viewed as a continuum analogue of the XY chain, can be found in [45].

This result does not extend to the anisotropic XY chain, were the particle number is not preserved and thus particles can be created by local properties of the dynamics, even if the system if fully in the MBL phase.

In essentially the same way one can show the absence of energy transport in the MBL phase. For this let S_1, S_2 be as above, but assume that $S_1 = [a, b]$ is an interval. By H_{S_1} we denote the restriction of the isotropic XY chain to S_1, given as in (39) with $[1, n]$ replaced by $[a, b]$ (but still acting on the full spin chain). Thus $\langle H_{S_1}\rangle_\rho$ is the expected energy of a state ρ in S_1.

Theorem 7.1. *Consider the isotropic XY chain $H = H_{iso}$ as in (39) and the particle profile ρ as in (43), with $\eta_j = 0$ for all $j \in \Lambda \setminus S_2$. Then under the assumption of eigencorrelator localization (9) we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_t |\langle H_{S_1}\rangle_{\rho_t} - \tilde{E}_0|\right) \leq \frac{4CD}{(1-e^{-\eta})^2} e^{-\eta d(S_1,S_2)}. \tag{45}$$

Here $\tilde{E}_0 = \langle H_{S_1}\rangle_\rho = \sum_{j\in S_1} \nu_j$ and D is a uniform upper bound on the matrix norm of the Anderson model A in (3).

The uniform matrix bound D can be chosen to be for example $D = 2\mu_{max} + \nu_{max}$, where μ_{max} and ν_{max} are the maximal values of the distributions of $|\mu_j|$ and $|\nu_j|$, respectively. To interpret (45), note that by construction of ρ at time $t = 0$ all its interaction energy is concentrated in S_2, so that the amount of energy which can be transported from S_2 to S_1 is exponentially small in the distance of the two subsystems, uniformly in time.

A weakened version of (7.1) can be shown to hold for the more general anisotropic XY chain (1).

Theorem 7.2. *Consider the anisotropic XY chain H given in (1) with the assumption of eigencorrelator localization (9). Let ρ be the general particle profile as in (43). Then there is a constant $C' < \infty$, depending on the parameters of the Hamiltonian, but independent of the sizes of Λ and S_1, such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_t |\langle H_{S_1}\rangle_{\rho_t} - \langle H_{S_1}\rangle_\rho|\right) \leq C', \tag{46}$$

The constant bound in (46) means that the energy fluctuations within the subsystem S_1 are uniformly bounded from above, while the full energy $\langle H\rangle_\rho$ will grow linearly in the size of Λ.

Detailed proofs of Theorems 7.1 and 7.2 are provided in Appendix A.

8. Fock space localization

Many-body localization of eigenstates is generally expected to correspond to localization in Fock space, not in physical space, e.g. [5, 9, 10]. This refers to a picture where the Fock space basis of Slater determinants of the (non-interacting) single-particle eigenstates is used as a reference lattice, and eigenstates of the interacting system can be labelled by the Fock space basis and decay rapidly (exponentially) in the distance from some finite subset of the lattice. Here we demonstrate this form of MBL for the disordered XY chain.

As in Section 7 we consider the isotropic XY quantum spin chain in transversal field

$$H_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\sigma_j^X \sigma_{j+1}^X + \sigma_j^Y \sigma_{j+1}^Y) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j \sigma_j^Z = 2c^* A c + \tilde{E}_0, \tag{47}$$

but now for the case of high disorder, meaning we choose the constant $\varepsilon > 0$ close to zero. Thus the effective Hamiltonian

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -\nu_1 & \varepsilon & & \\ \varepsilon & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \varepsilon \\ & & \varepsilon & -\nu_n \end{pmatrix} \tag{48}$$

is the Anderson model on $[1, \ldots, n]$ at high disorder.

Elgart and Klein [18] have recently provided a variant of the multiscale analysis method, based on a direct analysis of eigenvectors and eigenvalues rather than on decay properties of the Green function, which allows to show that, with high probability, the eigenvectors of the Anderson model at high disorder (in any dimension) are close to the canonical basis vectors, uniformly in all lattice sites.

In [18] it is assumed that the common distribution μ of the random parameters ν_j has compact support and is α-Hölder continuous for some $\alpha \in (1/2, 1]$, i.e. there exists $K < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \mu\{[a, a+t]\} \leq K t^\alpha, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \tag{49}$$

Under this assumption the following is a consequence of Theorem 1.6 in [18]:

Let $0 < \tau < 1$ and $\eta > 0$ be given. Then there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\xi > 0$ such that, for $n \geq n_0$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{[1, \ldots, n] \text{ is } \eta\text{-localizing for } A\} \geq 1 - e^{-n^\xi}. \tag{50}$$

The property of being η-localizing, see Definition 1.5 in [18], includes that A has an orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions φ_k, $k \in 1, \ldots, n$, such that

$$|\varphi_k(j)| \leq e^{-\eta|k-j|} \quad \text{for all } j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \text{ with } |j-k| \geq n^\tau. \tag{51}$$

We mention that more explicit results on the sizes and relations between the parameters n, η, ε, ξ and τ can be found in [18], with more recent improvements in [30].

Thus, with probability $1 - e^{-n^\xi}$, there are normalized eigenfunctions φ_k of A satisfying (51). As A is real, the φ_k can be chosen real. They determine the orthogonal matrix U in (40) as $U(k, j) = \varphi_k(j)$.

A basis of eigenvectors of the non-interacting system $H_{\varepsilon=0}$ is given by the spin basis e_α, $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^n$. We re-label this basis by Fermionic particle configurations, i.e. by the lattice sites of the antisymmetric Fock space,

$$\{(j_1, \ldots, j_r) : 0 \leq r \leq n, 1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_r \leq n\} \tag{52}$$

as $\tilde{e}_{(j_1, \ldots, j_r)} = e_\alpha$ with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $\{j : \alpha_j = 1\} = \{j_1 < \ldots < j_r\}$. These correspond to the Slater determinants of the eigenvectors e_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, of the effective Hamiltonian A (at $\varepsilon = 0$).

Similarly, we label the eigenvectors (42) of the interacting system by particle configurations with respect to the free Fermion system (41) as $\tilde{\psi}_{(k_1, \ldots, k_r)} = \psi_\beta$, $\beta \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $\{k : \beta_k = 1\} = \{k_1, \ldots, k_r\}$. In this basis H_{iso} is represented as $2d\Gamma_a(A) + \tilde{E}_0 \mathbb{1}$, where $d\Gamma_a(A)$ is the restriction of the second quantization of the effective Hamiltonian A to the anti-symmetric Fock space $\mathcal{F}_a(\mathbb{C}^n)$.

Fock space localization of H_ε means that the Fourier coefficients $\langle \tilde{\psi}_{(k_1,\dots,k_r)}, \tilde{e}_{(j_1,\dots,j_r)} \rangle$ of its eigenvectors with respect to the basis of the non-interacting system decay rapidly in the distance of the Fermionic configurations $k = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ and $j = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$. As in Section 5 we choose the latter as $D(j,k) := \max_{\ell \in \{1,\dots,r\}} |j_\ell - k_\ell|$. The first part of the following result establishes Fock space localization of H_ϵ with respect to this distance.

The second part is a result of similar flavor with a more direct proof. Here we use the local spin occupation operators $n_x := c_x^* c_x = a_x^* a_x$ to express closeness of the vectors $\tilde{\psi}_k$ to the non-interacting basis vectors.

Theorem 8.1. *For given $0 < \tau < 1$ and $\eta > 0$, let n_0, ε_0 and ξ be as above and choose $\eta_0 < \eta$. Then, for $n \geq n_0$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, it holds with probability at least $1 - e^{-n^\xi}$ that:*

(a) There is a constant $C = C(\eta, \tau)$ such that for every $1 \leq r \leq n$ and every pair of Fermionic configurations $k = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ and $j = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$ with $D(j,k) \geq 2n^\tau$,

$$\left| \langle \tilde{\psi}_k, \tilde{e}_j \rangle \right| \leq C n^{2\tau} e^{-\frac{\eta - \eta_0}{4} D(j,k)}. \tag{53}$$

(b) For every $1 \leq x \leq n$ and every Fermionic configuration $k = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ with $\min_\ell \{|k_\ell - x|\} \geq n^\tau$,

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_k, n_x \tilde{\psi}_k \rangle \leq \frac{2}{e^{2\eta \min_\ell \{|k_\ell - x|\}} - 1}. \tag{54}$$

These results have not been previously published and we provide detailed proofs in Appendix B.

Remark 8.2. (i) Note that n_x is the orthogonal projection onto the space spanned by the spin product states e_α with $\alpha_x = 1$, so that $\langle \tilde{\psi}_k, n_x \tilde{\psi}_k \rangle$ is the component of $\tilde{\psi}_k$ in that space. (54) says that this component is small if the configuration k contains no "particles" near x.

(ii) The need for the condition $|j - k| \geq n^\tau$ may be, at least partially, an artifact of the method of proof in [18]. But it is likely that a condition of this form is not entirely avoidable. For example, as the random potential will be essentially constant on arbitrarily long intervals with high probability, there will be eigenfunctions which are widely spread out before transitioning to exponential decay as in (51). Note, however, that $\tau > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small. As a consequence of the details in [18] this would yield that ξ is close to zero as well. An interesting open question is if disorder averaging might eliminate the restriction $|j - k| \geq n^\tau$ from (51), i.e. if exponential decay of $\mathbb{E}(|\varphi_k(j)|)$ can be proven for the Anderson model at large disorder.

9. Summary and Outlook

In this paper we reviewed several aspects of MBL in the context of the disordered XY chains: localization properties of the energy eigenstates and thermal states, propagation bounds of Lieb-Robinson type, decay of correlation functions, absence of transport of particles and energy, bounds on bipartite entanglement, the dynamical generation of entanglement, eigenstate labeling and so-called Fock space localization. The exact mapping of the XY chain to a system of quasi-free fermions and access to detailed information about the localization properties of the related one-body operator, play an essential role in the derivation of these results for the XY chain. We believe that having detailed, rigorous, and quite specific results for the XY chain is helpful in shaping our understanding of the subtle issues

raised by MBL, and can be used as a stepping stone to more general mathematical results about MBL in disordered quantum spin systems and other quantum many-body systems.

We conclude with a discussion of two conjectures and further directions for mathematical research on MBL. The first conjecture is concerned with one-dimensional systems of spins or fermions. Based on numerical work on the disordered quantum Ising chain in a random field, it was conjectured that such a one-dimensional system, at sufficiently large disorder exhibits full MBL in the sense that there exists a (random) quasi-local unitary transformation $U(\omega)$ that maps the Hamiltonian $H(\omega)$ in to a random but diagonal Ising-type model:

$$U(\omega)^* H(\omega) U(\omega) = \sum_X K_X(\omega) \sigma_X^Z, \tag{55}$$

where the sum runs over finite subsets $X = \{j_1, \cdots, j_k\}$ of the one-dimensional lattice, $\sigma_X^Z = \sigma_{j_1}^Z \cdots \sigma_{j_k}^Z$. The random couplings are short-range, e.g., in the sense that there are constants a, M such that

$$\sup_{j,k} e^{a|j-k|} \sum_{\substack{X \\ j,k \in X}} |K_X(\omega)| \leq M, \text{ in a suitable probabilistic sense.} \tag{56}$$

A good quasi-locality property of $U(\omega)$ would be the following Lieb-Robinson-type inequality with a sufficiently fast decaying function F and an exponent $p \geq 0$: for any pair of observables A and B supported on finite sets X and Y, one has

$$\|[U(\omega)^* A U(\omega), B]\| \leq \|A\| \, \|B\| |X|^p F(\min\{|j-k| \mid j \in X, k \in Y\}). \tag{57}$$

The work by Imbrie on the random quantum Ising chain provides evidence for such a property [28], but requires an unproven assumption of level repulsion in the spectrum of the system. Ideally, one would want a general result that applies to any sufficiently disordered one-dimensional lattice system with finite-range interactions, without hard to verify assumptions about their eigenvalue statistics.

The second conjecture generalizes the zero-velocity Lieb-Robinson bounds found for the XY chain to general disordered finite range spin models on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For $d \geq 2$, MBL may be seen only at low energies, although in what sense is still a matter of debate (see, e.g., [16, 17]).

Let P_E denote the spectral projection onto the energy interval $[E_0, E_0 + E]$, with E_0 the ground state energy. We would then like to have constants $C, c, \mu > 0$, and $q \geq 0$, a function $g_E(t)$ such that for any pair of finite disjoint subsets $X, Y \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, and observables A and B supported on X and Y, respectively, one has for $0 \leq E \leq c\mathrm{dist}(X,Y)^q$, the bound

$$\mathbb{E}(\|[\tau_t^\omega(P_E A P_E), B]\|) \leq C\|A\|\|B\||X| g_E(t) e^{-\mu d(X,Y)}, t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{58}$$

Here, $\mathbb{E}$ denotes the expectation with respect to the randomness, τ_t^ω is the Heisenberg dynamics generated by the random Hamiltonian, and one is interested in showing the inequality with a function $g_E(t)$ of moderate growth. E.g., a good example would be $g_E(t) \sim |t|^\alpha$, for some $\alpha \geq 0$. The standard Lieb-Robinson bound for systems with a bounded finite-range interaction holds with $g_E(t) = C \exp(v|t|)$, where $v > 0$ is a bound for the Lieb-Robinson velocity and for translation invariant systems ballistic propagation, i.e., with a positive velocity, is in general expected. So, any function g_E which grows strictly slower than exponential could provide non-trivial new information.

Among the more refined mathematical properties worth investigating we mention the disorder-averaged distribution of the difference between consecutive eigenvalues of the many-body Hamiltonian. Numerical study of a simple one-dimensional model indicates a clear

distinction between a delocalized regime at weak disorder and a localized regime at strong disorder [40]. In the first the distribution very much looks like the one found for a GOE random matrix, whereas at strong disorder the distribution is consistent with a Poisson distribution of eigenvalues at not too small values of the spacing. Establishing the existence of these two regimes, and perhaps also the existence of an intermediate phase, in a bona-fide many body model is certainly a significant mathematical challenge, but it is only by tackling challenging questions that we have a chance to make progress. In this spirit, it makes sense to also ask about MBL for bosons, such as phonons in disordered crystal lattices [34]. One could again start by considering disordered models reducible to a one-body operator such as the ones studied in [38, 39] and then continue with perturbations of such models.

Acknowledgements

The work of BN was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant DMS-1515850. GS acknowledges hospitality at the Steklov Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg where part of this work was done.

Appendix A. Proof of Theorems 7.1 and 7.2

For the proof of Theorem 7.1, we first write $H_{S_1} = 2c^* A_{S_1} c + \tilde{E}_0 \mathbb{1}$, where A_{S_1} is the restriction of Anderson model A in (3) to S_1, i.e. $A_{S_1} := \chi_{S_1} A \chi_{S_1}$ and $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)^t$. Then

$$\langle H_{S_1} \rangle_\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} (A_{S_1})_{jk} \langle c_j^* c_k \rangle_\rho + \tilde{E}_0 = \tilde{E}_0 \tag{59}$$

where we used that $\langle c_j^* c_k \rangle_\rho = 0$ for $j, k \in S_1$. For positive times, one can see that

$$\langle H_{S_1} \rangle_{\rho_t} - \tilde{E}_0 = \langle \tau_t(H_{S_1}) \rangle_\rho - \tilde{E}_0 = \langle 2\tau_t(c^*) A_{S_1} \tau_t(c) \rangle_\rho = 2 \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} (e^{2itA} A_{S_1} e^{-2itA})_{jk} \langle c_j^* c_k \rangle_\rho \tag{60}$$

where we used $\tau_t(c) = e^{-2itA} c$, the isotropic case of (14). The sum in (60) can be written as a trace,

$$\langle H_{S_1} \rangle_{\rho_t} - \tilde{E}_0 = 2 \operatorname{tr} e^{2itA} A_{S_1} e^{-2itA} \eta \chi_{S_2} \tag{61}$$

where $\eta = \eta \chi_{S_2}$ is the diagonal $n \times n$ matrix supported on S_2 with diagonal elements $1 - \eta_j$ for $j \in S_2$. This means that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \tau_t(H_{S_1}) - \tilde{E}_0 \rangle_{\rho_t} \right| &\leq 2 \left| \operatorname{tr} \chi_{S_2} e^{2itA} \chi_{S_1} A \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itA} \eta \right| \\ &\leq 2 \| \chi_{S_2} e^{2itA} \chi_{S_1} \|_1 \| A \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itA} \eta \| \\ &\leq 2 \|A\| \sum_{j \in S_2} \sum_{k \in S_1} |(e^{2itA})_{jk}|, \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where we used cyclicity of the trace in the first step and that the trace norm can be bounded by the sum of the absolute values of the matrix elements.

Bound (45) follows by taking the sup over all times, then averaging and using eigencorrelator localization (9).

In the anisotropic case of Theorem 7.2, corresponding to (4) we have

$$H_{S_1} = (\mathcal{C})^* M_{S_1} \mathcal{C}, \tag{63}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = (c_1, c_1^*, \ldots, c_n, c_n^*)^t$ and M_{S_1} is the $2 \times 2-$block restriction of the matrix M given in (5) to S_1, i.e., the restriction to $\mathrm{span}\{\delta_{2j-1}, \delta_{2j},\ j \in S_1\}$,

$$M_{S_1} := \chi_{S_1} M \chi_{S_1}. \tag{64}$$

One can easily see that

$$\langle H_{S_1} \rangle_\rho = \langle \mathcal{C}^* M_{S_1} \mathcal{C} \rangle_\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2n} \langle \delta_j, M_{S_1} \delta_k \rangle \langle (\mathcal{C}^*)_j (\mathcal{C})_k \rangle_\rho = \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1} \Gamma M, \tag{65}$$

with the correlation matrix $\Gamma = \mathrm{diag}\{\eta_1, 1-\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n, 1-\eta_n\}$. Here we recall that χ_{S_1} is the 2×2-block restriction to S_1, we also need to stress here that we used $\langle \delta_j, M_{S_1} \delta_k \rangle$ to refer to the jk-th element (not block) of M_{S_1}. Likewise, $(\mathcal{C}^*)_j$ is the j-component of the vector $\mathcal{C}^*$.

By evolving the system in time, one can see that

$$\langle H_{S_1} \rangle_{\rho_t} = \langle \tau_t(\mathcal{C}^*) M_{S_1} \tau_t(\mathcal{C}) \rangle_\rho = \langle \mathcal{C}^* e^{2itM} M_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \mathcal{C} \rangle_\rho = \mathrm{tr}\, e^{2itM} M_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \Gamma \tag{66}$$

where we used (14).

Note that (66) can be written as

$$\langle H_{S_1} \rangle_{\rho_t} = \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \Gamma \chi_{S_1} e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1} M + \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \Gamma \chi_{S_1^c} e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1} M \tag{67}$$

And since we are looking at the difference $\langle \tau_t(H_{S_1}) - H_{S_1} \rangle_\rho$, we can rewrite (65) to match (67) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_{S_1} \rangle_\rho \ &= \ \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \Gamma \chi_{S_1} e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1} M + \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \chi_{S_1} \Gamma e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1^c} M \\ &\quad + \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1^c} e^{-2itM} \chi_{S_1} \Gamma M e^{2itM} \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Then subtracting (68) from (67) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau_t(H_{S_1}) - H_{S_1} \rangle_\rho \ &= \ \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \chi_{S_1^c} \Gamma e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1} M - \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1} e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1^c} M \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \Gamma \\ &\quad - \mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{S_1^c} e^{-2itM} \chi_{S_1} \Gamma M e^{2itM} \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where we used $[M, e^{2itM}] = [\Gamma, \chi_{S_1}] = 0$. By taking the absolute value

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \tau_t(H_{S_1}) - H_{S_1} \rangle_\rho| \ &\leq \ \|\chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \chi_{S_1^c}\|_1 \|\Gamma e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1} M\| \\ &\quad + \|\chi_{S_1} e^{2itM} \chi_{S_1^c}\|_1 \|M \chi_{S_1} e^{-2itM} \Gamma\| \\ &\quad + \|\chi_{S_1^c} e^{-2itM} \chi_{S_1}\|_1 \|\Gamma M e^{2itM}\| \\ &\leq \ 3 \cdot 2 \|M\| \sum_{j \in S_1} \sum_{k \in S_1^c} \|(e^{2itM})_{jk}\|. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Here $(e^{2itM})_{jk}$ are the 2×2-block elements of e^{2itM} and we used the simple fact that for any $2n \times 2n$ matrix A with 2×2 block elements A_{jk} we have $\|A\|_1 \leq 2 \sum_{j,k=1}^n \|A_{jk}\|$.

The bound (46) follows by taking the supremum over all times, then averaging and using eigencorrelator localization (9).

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 8.1

To prove part (a) of Theorem 8.1 we expand the vectors $\tilde{\psi}$ in terms of the vectors $\tilde{e}$. This calculation is well known, for example it is not hard to see that the resulting (73) below arises as a special case of (21). We include the argument here for completeness.

From $\psi_0 = e_0$ and $\tilde{b}_k^* = \sum_{j=1}^n U(k,j) c_j^* = \sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_k(j) c_j^*$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\psi}_{(k_1,\ldots,k_r)} &= \prod_{m=1}^r \tilde{b}_{k_m}^* e_0 = \prod_{m=1}^r \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^n \varphi_{k_m}(j_m) c_{j_m}^* \right) e_0 \\
&= \sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_r \text{ distinct}} \prod_{m=1}^r \varphi_{k_m}(j_m) c_{j_m}^* e_0 \\
&= \sum_{j_1<\ldots<j_r} \sum_{\pi\in S_r} \left(\prod_{m=1}^r \varphi_{k_m}(j_{\pi(m)}) \right) \left(\prod_{m=1}^r c_{j_{\pi(m)}}^* \right) e_0 \\
&= \sum_{j_1<\ldots<j_r} \sum_{\pi\in S_r} \left(\prod_{m=1}^r \varphi_{k_m}(j_{\pi(m)}) \right) (-1)^{sgn(\pi)+\sum_{m=1}^r j_m - r} \tilde{e}_{(j_1,\ldots,j_r)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Here we have used the CAR to normal order the c_j^* and that, up to sign changes, c_j^* acts on the spin basis by flipping up the j-th spin. The final result becomes

$$\tilde{\psi}_{(k_1,\ldots,k_r)} = \sum_{j_1<\ldots<j_r} \left((-1)^{\sum_{m=1}^r j_m - r} \det\left(\varphi_{k_m}(j_\ell)\right)_{m,\ell=1}^r \right) \tilde{e}_{(j_1,\ldots,j_r)}. \tag{72}$$

From this we read off that for arbitrary $1 \le r \le n$, $1 \le k_1 < \ldots < k_r \le n$ and $1 \le j_1 < \ldots < j_r \le n$,

$$\left| \langle \tilde{\psi}_{(k_1,\ldots,k_r)}, \tilde{e}_{(j_1,\ldots,j_r)} \rangle \right| = \left| \det\left(\varphi_{k_m}(j_\ell)\right)_{m,\ell=1}^r \right|, \tag{73}$$

while $\langle \tilde{\psi}_{(k_1,\ldots,k_r)}, \tilde{e}_{(j_1,\ldots,j_s)} \rangle = 0$ if $r \neq s$ (which reflects particle number conservation).

Given exponential decay (51) of the one-particle Hamiltonian, we now get decay of the Slater determinant on the right of (73) as a special case of a result from [47], stated as Theorem 5.1 in Section 5 above:

Let ω be the $n \times n$-matrix with matrix elements $\langle \delta_j, \omega \delta_k \rangle = \varphi_k(j)$. This matrix is unitary and, in particular, $\|\omega\| = 1$. To incorporate the result of [18] we choose the growth function K piecewise as $K(\ell) = 0$ if $\ell < n^\tau$ and $K(\ell) = \ell$ if $\ell \ge n^\tau$. Then (51) says that $|\langle \delta_j, \omega \delta_k \rangle| \le e^{-\eta K(|j-k|)}$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-n^\xi}$. Thus we can apply (25) for any $\eta_0 < \eta$. For the given choice of K we find $I(\mu_0) \le C(\mu_0, \tau) n^{2\tau}$. This readily yields (53), completing the proof of part (a) of Theorem 8.1.

The proof of part (b) is straightforward: From (42) and $c_x = \sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_j(x) \tilde{b}_j$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \tilde{\psi}_k, n_x \tilde{\psi}_k \rangle &= \langle \tilde{\psi}_k, c_x^* c_x \tilde{\psi}_k \rangle \\
&= \sum_{j_1,j_2} \varphi_{j_1}(x) \varphi_{j_2}(x) \langle \tilde{b}_{j_1} \prod_{m=1}^r \tilde{b}_{k_m}^* \psi_0, \tilde{b}_{j_2} \prod_{\ell=1}^r \tilde{b}_{k_\ell}^* \psi_0 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{j_1} |\varphi_{j_1}(x)|^2 \| \tilde{b}_{j_1} \prod_{m=1}^r \tilde{b}_{k_m}^* \psi_0 \|^2 = \sum_{m=1}^r |\varphi_{k_m}(x)|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where we have used that $\|\tilde{b}_j \prod_{m=1}^{r} \tilde{b}^*_{k_m} \psi_0\|^2$ is 1 if $j \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_r\}$ and 0 otherwise. By our assumption $\min_\ell\{|k_\ell - x|\} \geq n^\tau$ we can use (51) to bound this by

$$\sum_{j=\min_\ell\{|k_\ell - x|\}}^{\infty} |\varphi_j(x)|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{j=\min_\ell\{|k_\ell - x|\}}^{\infty} e^{-2\eta j}, \tag{75}$$

which is the bound claimed in (54).

References

[1] H. Abdul-Rahman, B. Nachtergaele, R. Sims and G. Stolz, *Entanglement Dynamics of Disordered Quantum XY Chains*, Lett. Math. Phys. **106** (2016), 649–674

[2] H. Abdul-Rahman and G. Stolz, *A uniform Area Law for the entanglement of eigenstates in the disordered XY-chain*, J. Math. Phys. **56** (2015), 121901, 25 pp.

[3] M. Aizenman and S. Molchanov, *Localization at large disorder and at extreme energies*, Commun. Math. Phys. **157** (1993), 245–278

[4] M. Aizenman and S. Warzel, *Random operators. Disorder effects on quantum spectra and dynamics*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 168, Am. Math. Soc., Providence (2015)

[5] B. L. Altshuler, Y. Gefen, A. Kamenev and L. S. Levitov, *Quasiparticle Lifetime in a Finite System: A Non-Perturbative Approach*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997), 2803

[6] V. Bach, E. H. Lieb and J. P. Solovej, *Generalized Hartree-Fock theory and the Hubbard model*, J. Stat. Phys. **76** (1994), 3–89

[7] M.-C. Bañuls, J. I. Cirac and M. M. Wolf, *Entanglement in fermionic systems*, Physical Review **A 76** (2007), 022311

[8] J. H. Bardarson, F. Pollmann and J. E. Moore, *Unbounded growth of entanglement in models of many-body localization*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012), 017202

[9] D. M. Basko, I. L. Aleiner and B. L. Altshuler, *Metal-insulator transition in a weakly interacting many-electron system with localized single-particle states*, Annals of Physics **321** (2006), 1126–1205

[10] B. Bauer and C. Nayak, Area laws in a many-body localized state and its implications for topological order, J. Stat. Mech. (2013), P09005

[11] F. Brandao and M. Horodecki, An area law for entanglement from exponential decay of correlations, Nature Physics 9 (2013), 721–726

[12] F. Brandao and M. Horodecki, *Exponential decay of correlations implies area law*, Comm. Math. Phys. **333** (2015), 761–798

[13] O. Bratteli and D. Robinson, D.: Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics 2, 2nd ed., New York, NY, Springer Verlag, 1997

[14] C. K. Burrell and T. J. Osborne, *Bounds on the speed of information propagation in disordered quantum spin chains*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99** (2007), 167201

[15] J. Chapman and G. Stolz, *Localization for random block operators related to the XY spin chain*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **16** (2015), 405–435

[16] W. De Roeck and F. Huveneers, *Can translation invariant systems exhibit a Many-Body Localized phase?*, To appear in the Proceedings of the conference Particle systems and PDE's - II, held at the Center of Mathematics of the University of Minho in December 2013, arXiv:1409.8054

[17] W. De Roeck, F. Huveneers, M. Müller and M. Schiulaz, *Absence of many-body mobility edges*, Phys. Rev. B **93** (2016), 014203

[18] A. Elgart and A. Klein, *An eigensystem approach to Anderson localization*, arXiv:1509.08521

[19] A. Elgart, L. Pastur and M. Shcherbina, *Large block properties of the entanglement entropy of disordered Fermions*, arXiv:1601.00294

[20] A. Elgart, M. Shamis and S. Sodin, *Localisation for non-monotone Schrödinger operators*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **16** (2014), 909–924

[21] C. Fernández-González, N. Schuch, M. M. Wolf, J. I. Cirac, D. Pérez-García, *Frustration free gapless Hamiltonians for Matrix Product States*, Commun. Math. Phys. **333** (2015), 299–333

[22] I. V. Gornyi, A. D. Mirlin and D. G. Polyakov, *Interacting electrons in disordered wires: Anderson localization and low-temperature transport*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005), 206603

[23] E. Hamza, R. Sims and G. Stolz, *Dynamical localization in disordered quantum spin systems*, Comm. Math. Phys. **315** (2012) 215–239
[24] M. B. Hastings, *Locality in quantum and Markov dynamics on lattices and networks*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004), 140402
[25] M. B. Hastings, *An area law for one dimensional quantum systems*, J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. (2007), P08024
[26] W. W. Ho and D. A. Abanin, *Entanglement dynamics in quantum many-body systems*, arXiv:1508.03784
[27] D. A. Huse, R. Nandkishore and V. Oganesyan, *Phenomenology of fully many-body-localized systems*, Phys. Rev. B **90** (2014), 174202
[28] J. Z. Imbrie, *On Many-Body Localization for Quantum Spin Chains*, J. Stat. Phys. **163** (2016), 998–1048
[29] A. Klein and J. F. Perez, *Localization in the ground-state of the one dimensional X-Y model with a random transverse field*, Comm. Math. Phys. **128** (1990), 99–108
[30] A. Klein and S. Tsang, *Eigensystem bootstrap multiscale analysis for the Anderson model*, arXiv:1605.03637
[31] H. Kunz and B. Souillard, *Sur le spectre des opérateurs aux différences finies aléatoires*, Commun. Math. Phys. **78** (1980), 201–246
[32] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, *The finite group velocity of quantum spin systems*, Commun. Math. Phys. **28** (1972), 251–257
[33] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, *Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain*, Annals of Physics **16** (1961), 407–466
[34] C. Monthus and T. Garel, *Anderson localization of phonons in dimension $d = 1, 2, 3$: Finite-size properties of the inverse participation ratios of eigenstates* Phys. Rev. B **81** (2010), 224208
[35] B. Nachtergaele, *The spectral gap for some spin chains with discrete symmetry breaking*, Commun. Math. Phys., **175** (1996), 565–606
[36] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, *Lieb-Robinson bounds and the exponential clustering theorem*, Commun. Math. Phys. **265** (2006), 119–130
[37] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, *Lieb-Robinson bounds in quantum many-body physics*, Entropy and the Quantum (Tucson, AZ, 2009), 141–176, Contemp. Math. **529**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010
[38] B. Nachtergaele, R. Sims and G. Stolz, *Quantum harmonic oscillator systems with disorder*, J. Stat. Phys. **149** (2012), 969–1012
[39] B. Nachtergaele, R. Sims and G. Stolz, *An area law for the bipartite entanglement of disordered oscillator systems*, J. Math. Phys. **54** (2013), 042110
[40] V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, *Localization of interacting fermions at high temperature*, Phys. Rev. B **75** (2007), 155111
[41] A. Pal and D. A. Huse, *The many-body localization phase transition*, Phys. Rev. B **82** (2010), 174411
[42] L. Pastur and V. Slavin, *On the Area Law for Disordered Free Fermions*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014), 150404
[43] I. Peschel and V. Eisler, *Reduced density matrices and entanglement entropy in free lattice models*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, (2009), 504003
[44] M. Plenio, *The logarithmic negativity: A full entanglement monotone that is not convex*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005), 090503
[45] R. Seiringer and S. Warzel, *Decay of correlations and absence of superfluidity in the disordered Tonks-Girardeau gas*, New J. Physics **18** (2016), 035002
[46] M. Serbyn, Z. Papic and D. A. Abanin, *Universal slow growth of entanglement in interacting strongly disordered systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013), 260601
[47] R. Sims and S. Warzel, *Decay of Determinantal and Pfaffian Correlation Functionals in One-dimensional Lattices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **347** (2016), 903–931
[48] G. Stolz, *An introduction to the mathematics of Anderson localization*, In: Entropy and the Quantum II. Contemp. Math. **552**, pp. 71–108. Am. Math. Soc., Providence (2011)
[49] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico and A. Kitaev, *Entanglement in quantum critical phenomena*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003), 227902
[50] G. Vidal and F. Werner, *Computable measure of entanglement*, Phys. Rev. A **65** (2002), 032314
[51] R. Vosk and E. Altman, *Many-body localization in one dimension as a dynamical renormalization group fixpoint*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013), 067204

[52] R. Vosk and E. Altman, *Dynamical quantum phase transitions in random spin chains*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014), 217204

[53] W. Wootters, *Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998), 2245–2248

[54] M. Znidaric, T. Prosen and P. Prelovsek, *Many-body localization in the Heisenberg XXZ magnet in a random field*, Phys. Rev. B **77** (2008), 064426

Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA
E-mail address: houssam@math.arizona.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95616
E-mail address: bxn@math.ucdavis.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA
E-mail address: rsims@math.arizona.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL 35294 USA
E-mail address: stolz@math.uab.edu